UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,599	02/09/2007	Yasuhiro Fujita	AOI-P41	8619
26793 LEIGHTON K.	7590 05/21/201 CHONG	EXAMINER		
PATENT ATTORNEY			ANDRISH, SEAN D	
133 KAAI STREET HONOLULU, HI 96821			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3672	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/21/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/567,599	FUJITA, YASUHIRO		
Examiner initiated interview cultimary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	SEAN D. ANDRISH	3672		
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_		
(1) <u>SEAN D. ANDRISH</u> .	(3)			
(2) <u>Leighton Chong</u> .	(4)			
Date of Interview: <u>5/11/10</u> ; <u>5/12/10</u>	Time:			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicate Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)			
Part I.				
Rejection(s) discussed: NA				
Claims discussed: NA				
Prior art documents discussed: NA				
Part II.				
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet				
Part III.				
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand 	e examiner will provide a writte record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview		
/David J. Bagnell/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3672				
	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: A notice of allowance has been mailed and the issue fee has been paid for the present application. On 11 May 2010, Examiner contacted applicant to inform him that editorial changes to the specification are required before the patent can be published. Specifically, the Summary of the Invention section of the specification contains numerous references to specific claims, and each of the references to the claims should be removed prior to publication of the patent. For example, the phrase "as claimed in claim 1", as recited on lines 3 - 4 of page 3, should be deleted from the specification. The Summary of the Invention is replete with similar errors. Examiner requested that applicant file a 312 amendment to make the necessary changes to the specification. Examiner noted that the MPEP 714(II)(B) allows applicant to replace an entire section of the specification and, just as with replacement paragraphs, replacement sections must contain the appropriate markings to indicate subject matter that has been deleted from the specification. Applicant agreed to prepare the 312 amendment and file it electronically.

In a follow-up telephone call on 12 May, 2010, examiner informed applicant that applicant did not have to file a 312 amendment to amend the specification as discussed on 11 May 2010 because the examiner will generate a supplemental examiner's amendment to make the agreed upon changes to the specification.